

2.2.7.8 Electric Power

Table 2–27 shows DOE’s estimate of the power demands at the Moab site and at the three potential off-site disposal locations for the three transportation modes. In general, the major demands would be:

- Field office trailers.
- Office and parking lot security lighting.
- River pump station (at Moab).
- Decontamination water sprays and recycle pumps.
- Train transfer station (rail transportation).
- Pipeline slurry system (pipeline transportation).

*Table 2–27. Estimated Maximum Average Annual Electric Power Demand (kVA)
For the Off-Site Disposal Alternative*

Transportation Mode	Location			
	Moab Site	Klondike Flats Site	Crescent Junction Site	White Mesa Mill Site
Truck	600	300	300	300
Rail	700	600	600	–
Pipeline	–	2,500 (terminal)	2,800 (terminal)	3,100 (terminal)
To Klondike Flats	3,400			4,800 (booster)
To Crescent Junction	4,800			
To White Mesa Mill	6,100			

2.3 Ground Water at the Moab Site

Section 2.3.1 provides background on the ground water standards, contaminants of concern, and the compliance strategy selection process. This includes remediation goals for the ground water, and the relationship with existing interim actions. Section 2.3.2 discusses the proposed ground water remediation, including remediation options and time frames, and the predicted contaminant concentrations as a result of active remediation. It also discusses the predicted outcome of the ground water No Action alternative. Section 2.3.3 discusses ground water remediation uncertainties.

2.3.1 Background

The uppermost aquifer at the Moab site occurs in unconsolidated Quaternary alluvial material deposited on older bedrock units in the basin that forms Moab Valley. Although the quality of this aquifer has been adversely affected by uranium processing activities at the site, it does not represent a potential source of drinking water. However, discharge of contaminated ground water from this aquifer has resulted in elevated concentrations of ammonia and other site-related constituents in the Colorado River. While the contaminants do not pose unacceptable risk to humans, they do exceed levels considered to be protective of aquatic life. Therefore, the objective of the proposed ground water action is to protect the environment, particularly endangered species of fish that are known to use that portion of the river.